DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 913 EA 020 479

AUTHOR Gerla, Samuel, E.
TITLE Examination of the Conditions and Expectations Surrounding Superintendent Selection in Washington State School Districts.
PUB DATE May 87
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Selection; *Board Administrator Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Qualifications; Job Applicants; Personnel Management; Personnel Selection; *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *Carlson (Richard); *Washington

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to collect data from 40 school superintendents who were newly hired in Washington school districts just prior to the 1986-87 school year, assess the conditions within a school district when hiring a superintendent; and evaluate expectations placed upon a new chief executive by the board of education. Thirty-eight superintendents completed and returned the survey for a 95 percent return rate. The theoretical foundations for the study rely on Richard O. Carlson's analyses of superintendent selection and succession processes. The research analyses matched Carlson's conclusions that involuntary school board turnover impacts what type of superintendent is hired; that gaps exist between superintendent performance and expectations; that new school board members feel they have a mandate for school improvement which is mirrored in the superintendent selection process; and that when the board has been dissatisfied with school administration, new superintendents are given authority to act. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300913

EXAMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS AND EXPECTATIONS SURROUNDING SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION IN WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Samuel E. Gerla

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. E. Gerla

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Washington State University

May, 1987

EA 020 479

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXAMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS AND EXPECTATIONS SURROUNDING SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION IN WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Executive Summary

The purpose for this study was to collect data from school superintendents who were newly hired in Washington school districts just prior to the 1986-87 school year. The study was inspired by Richard Carlson's book entitled Superintendents: Careers and Performance, in which he reaches conclusions concerning the types of individuals selected to superintendencies and the circumstances surrounding that selection. Carlson suggests that, in order to understand the attributes required for acceptance into the superintendent ranks, as well as the level of performance necessary to be successful, it is critical to consider the conditions existing within a school district when a superintendent is hired in addition to the expectations placed upon a new chief executive by the board of education.

Forty new superintendents received the survey instrument. Of that number, thirty-eight completed and returned the survey within three weeks, an extraordinary return rate of 95% without need for any type of followup correspondence from the researcher. The survey instrument was intentionally kept brief and to the point, and the high rate of participation supported the need for similar design in future efforts.

Of the thirty-eight respondents, twenty are from districts with enrollment of 500 or fewer students, seven from districts with enrollment between 501 and 2,000, and eight head districts whose enrollment falls between 2,001 and 5,000. One respondent serves a district of between 5,001 and 10,000 students, and two come from districts with enrollment above 10,000. Based upon a list of new superintendents provided by the Washington Association of School Administrators, four of the thirty-eight participants in this study (10.5%) are women.

Thirty-three of the new superintendents (86.8%) were hired from outside the district, while five (13.2%) were elevated from within. Of those selected from within the district, four identified their previous position. One was elevated from counselor, two from secondary principalships, and one previously served as assistant superintendent. Two of the five elevated from within were women. Within the thirty-three superintendents hired from outside, sixteen (48.5%) came directly from other superintendent positions. Ten (30.3%) served their previous district as assistant superintendent, four moved up from principalships, one each served as department chair and director of secondary education, and one did not respond to that item. Of special note, all districts with enrollment greater than 500 students who hired their superintendent from outside selected an individual with prior central office experience (assistant superintendent or superintendent).

With regard to total years in education, the mean for all respondents was 21.3 years, with a range from eight to thirty-six years. Two respondents had less than ten years in education, and a like number exceed thirty years. Among the sixteen participants with prior superintendent experience, the overall experience mean covered 25.6 years, while the mean for the twenty-two who are new to the superintendent ranks was 18.2 years.

Of those with prior superintendent experience, the average time spent as an administrator was 19.9 years, while those accepting a first superintendency had an administrative experience mean of 7.4 years. The range of administrative experience was from 0-30 years. Among the entire group of thirty-eight respondents, the average number of years as a superintendent (excluding 1986-87) was 4.4 years, and the entire group had served in an average of 1.7 former superintendencies (range: 0-4). The average tenure of immediate predecessors was 5.7 years in the position. The range of predecessors' years in the position was 1-22, with fifteen of the thirty-eight predecessors holding the position for three years or less, and five in the position for ten or more years.

In the area of board turnover, there were eighty-six instances spread among the thirty-eight districts within the past three years. The range was from no turnover in two districts to eight board changes in two other districts. It was not possible (using this survey instrument) to determine why specific board changes occurred, but it was interesting to note that forty changes (46.6%) involved filling unexpired terms, eighteen new board members (20.9%)

were elected in uncontested elections, a like number were elected in contested elections where the incumbent was not running, and ten changes (11.6%) came about as a result of incumbent defeat in a board election.

When asked to interpret the attitude of their new board concerning conditions existing in the district when they were hired, fifteen of the thirty-eight participants indicated that the board was satisfied with the district's situation, while twenty-three (61%) sensed either a moderate or high degree of dissatisfaction on the part of the board. As a followup, respondents were asked whether they were given mandates for action by their board upon being hired; twenty-four (63%) indicated that they had received board mandates. It was interesting to note the nearly parallel responses between the number of districts with dissatisfied boards and the number of new superintendents who reported receiving board mandates.

The final survey item asked participants to identify what their board was looking for when they were hired. Forty different qualities were identified, and the top ten were as follows:

1. Successful experience
2. Leadership > tie
   Active in community >
4. Public relations skills >
   Understands finance > three-way tie
   Effective communicator >
7. Accepts responsibility
8. Understands curriculum
9. Generates ideas > tie
   Team builder/manager >

Carlson (1972) observes that when the administration of a school district is perceived as unsatisfactory, the appointment will likely go to a career-bound (outside) individual. If the administration is perceived as satisfactory, appointment of a new cheif executive may go to either type (career-bound or place-bound). Carlson also suggests that involuntary board turnover impacts what type of superintendent is hired. When a board challenger unseats an incumbent, the majority of the voters believed, as did the winner, that a gap existed between community expectations and the school system's performance. Further, the challenger often feels that he or she has a mandate to strive for improvement. Thus, a board containing a victorious challenger includes at least one member somewhat committed to the notion that all is not right with the school system; and if that stance gains favor with the other members, a new superintendent will likely be selected from outside.

Another major conclusion drawn from Carlson's work may be that when a board is dissatisfied with the administration of the schools, the new superintendent is given a mandate to act. As the level of dissatisfaction increases, so do the scope and intensity of the mandate. The almost perfect match between the level of board dissatisfaction recognized by the participants in this study and the number of new superintendents who received mandates from the board provides strong support for Carlson's position in this area.

A copy of the complete report of survey findings is available upon written request.

EXAMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS AND EXPECTATIONS SURROUNDING SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION IN WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Introduction

On many occasions, reference is made in the literature to the most difficult and important policy decision that a school district's board of education will ever face--the selection of a chief executive officer, or superintendent, who will provide professional leadership and direction for all of the district's activities. Careful and proper selection of a new superintendent is essential to a school district's future success since the newly selected individual will have ultimate responsibility for placement and supervision of all faculty and staff, for making recommendations to the board on all policy matters, and for maximizing the district's effectiveness in all programs and activities.

In 1972, Richard O. Carlson authored a book entitled School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, in which he looked at the superintendent selection and succession processes. Carlson studied the personal and professional attributes of individuals who were selected to school superintendencies, identified several contingencies for those desiring to ascend to the superintendency, categorized two types of superintendent candidates (place-bound and career-bound), discussed the conditions under which each

type might be hired, and outlined the probable expectations (within a general framework) placed upon each of the two types once selection was made.

Carlson defines place-bound superintendents as those who are promoted from within the local school system. As might be expected, superintendents who are selected from outside the containing organization are called career-bound, according to Carlson. Although superintendents may be selected for a variety of reasons, Carlson maintains that when a high degree of satisfaction exists and the board wishes to maintain the district's current direction (status quo), a place-bound (or inside) individual is likely to be selected. In contrast, when a significant level of dissatisfaction is observable within a school district, the board is much more likely to look for ways to chart a new course or start fresh. Thus, someone from outside the district (career-bound) stands an excellent chance of being given serious consideration. To phrase it somewhat differently, when things are not going well, the board looks for someone who can provide creative leadership; on the other hand, when conditions are favorable, the board is likely to look for stabilizing leadership.

The Purpose of This Study

Even though leadership changeover is a key topic in the literature addressing group processes, there have been

relatively few studies that examine the attributes of chief administrators or organizational conditions as they may impact on patterns of executive turnover at the school district level. This is unfortunate considering the crucial importance in overall strategic planning of selecting and properly timing the replacement of the chief executive officer (Brady, Fulmer & Helmich, 1982).

Experienced educators agree that effective schools are those in which strong leadership is evident, and administrators are increasingly viewed as the key leaders of educational improvement (Aplin & Daresh, 1984; Austin, 1979; Edmonds, 1981; Lipham, 1981; Purkey & Smith, 1982). Almost without exception, boards of education profess a desire to hire the "most highly qualified" and "best available" candidates to lead their system (Sendor, 1981).

According to Mines (1980), there is no more significant economic investment than the one a company (school district) makes in its executives. The success of a company (school district) depends in large part on the people who lead it. In this "Search of Excellence" era, we are more than ever aware of how the quality and style of the chief executive officer puts an imprint on the whole organization and how important the morale of an organization can be to its success. Standards of excellence are set at the top (Korn, 1983).

March and March (1977) suggest that a chief executive job is a pairing of an individual and an organization. From the individual's point of view, it is a point on a career; each career is a sequential list of organizations managed by the individual. From the organization's point of view, a job is a point in the organization's chronology; each chronology is a sequential list of individuals who have managed the organization. Careers and chronologies are closely related.

Using the Carlson (1972) study as a foundation, this study was designed to collect data from school districts in the state of Washington who recently engaged in the superintendent selection process. This study was not designed to be comprehensive or all-inclusive, but data have been collected and analyzed for comparison with Carlson's findings relating to the types of individuals who are initially selected to be superintendents and his observations about what it takes to be successful in the superintendency. In order to understand the attributes required for acceptance into the superintendent ranks, as well as the level of performance necessary to be successful, it was essential to consider the conditions existing in school districts when superintendents are hired in addition to the expectations placed upon the new chief executive by the board of education.

Methodology

Selection of the Sample

In an attempt to limit the sample size, yet to be able to collect useful data from individuals who were directly involved with the superintendent selection process, a decision was made to target superintendents who were hired in Washington schools just prior to the 1986-87 school year. A list of the superintendents who fit that description was requested and received from the Washington Association of School Administrators. Forty-two superintendents were hired in this state prior to the current school year. Two of the forty-two were eliminated from the sample prior to data collection. One was hired as superintendent of an Educational Service District; thus, it would have been difficult to correlate data collected from that source with others. Also eliminated was the superintendent who replaced the individual conducting this study at the beginning of the 1986-87 school year. This decision was made due to the potential for conflict of interest on the part of the new superintendent while responding to the survey, as well as on the part of the surveyor when analyzing the data. As a result, the sample audience included forty newly-selected superintendents from school districts ranging in size from thirty students to over forty thousand students.

Design of the Survey Instrument

Since one of the purposes for this study was to collect background information from the new superintendents about themselves and their school districts, the first portion of the survey was focused in that area. Survey items 1-9 were designed to collect demographic data. Among the information solicited in the second portion of the survey (items 10-13) were the recent history of the makeup of the board of directors, and conditions existing in the district when the new superintendent was hired. In addition, an attempt was made to identify the need for change in the district as reflected by whether the new superintendent received mandates from the board, and respondents were asked to describe the qualities the board was looking for in a new superintendent.

In recognition of the incessant demand for the time and attention of school administrators to fill out surveys and data collection instruments of all types, the instrument used in this study was purposely kept brief. Most of the items called for closed-ended responses, with several modified closed-ended items and two open-ended items. Space was provided for respondents to indicate their desire to receive a summary of the results of the study.

Collection of the Data

On February 20, a copy of the survey instrument (see Appendix B) was mailed to each of the forty members of the sample audience, along with a cover letter (see Appendix A) describing the purpose for the study and the anticipated use of the findings. Participants were asked to return the completed survey by March 13, allowing approximately three weeks for return.

Within one week, ten completed surveys (25%) were returned. By the end of the second week, thirty-one surveys (78%) had been received; thirty-eight of forty (95%) were received by the March 13 deadline. Since no reminder was mailed, and the only contact with participants was by way of the initial request for cooperation, the rate of return was extremely high and gratifying to the surveyor. Due to the fact that the nature of several of the survey items might have created discomfort for the participants, the return rate greatly exceeded what had been anticipated. The high rate of return might also support the need for survey instruments which are brief, easily understood, and of interest to the participants.

The Results of This Study

Demographics

The raw data collected during this study may be found in Appendix C. With N = 38, twenty of the superintendents

responding (52.6%) are from school districts with enrollment of 500 or less (Category A). Seven (18.4%) are from districts with enrollment between 501 and 2,000 (Category B), while eight (21.1%) served in districts in the 2,001-5,000 student range (Category C). One (2.6%) heads a district whose enrollment falls between 5,001 and 10,000 (Category D), and the final two respondents represent districts with enrollment above 10,000 (Category E).

From the list of new superintendents provided by the Washington Association of School Administrators, it was determined that of the 38 participants in this survey, four (10.5%) are women. Two of those hold positions in Category A, one in Category C, and the fourth in Category D.

Thirty-three of the new superintendents (86.8%) were hired from outside the district, while five (13.2%) were elevated from within. Among those hired from within, two were hired in Category A, two in Category B, and the fifth in Category C. One of those hired from within in Category A was elevated from a counselor position while the other did not indicate a previous position. Both individuals elevated from within in Category B districts served as secondary (or high school) principals. In Category C, the elevation occurred from assistant superintendent to superintendent. Two of the five elevated from within (one in Category A and one in Category C) were women.

Of the thirty-three new superintendents hired from outside, sixteen (42.1%) came directly from other superintendencies. Ten (26.3%) served their previous district as assistant superintendent, four moved up from principalships, one each served as department chairperson and director of secondary education, and one did not respond to this survey item. Of special note, with the exception of Category A districts, all superintendents hired from outside came from prior central office positions (assistant superintendent or superintendent).

Thirty-two of the thirty-three superintendents hired from outside their current district provided information about the enrollment (by category) in their former district. Seventeen (53.1%) previously worked in Category A districts, five (15.6%) came from Category B districts, six (18.8 %) from Category C, one (3.1%) from Category D, and three (9.4%) from Category E.

As pertains to total number of years in education, the mean for each category is as follows:

Category A	20.2
Category B	21.6
Category C	23.2
Category D	21.0
Category E	25.0
Overall	21.3 years (Range = 8-36)

Two of the new superintendents have less than ten years total experience in education; two have over thirty years of experience.

Among the sixteen superintendents with prior superintendent experience, the overall experience mean is 25.6 years, while the overall mean for the twenty-two individuals without prior superintendent experience is 18.2 years. Of the thirty-four men who are new superintendents, the mean for total years of experience is 21.9 years (R = 8-36), while the four women have an experience mean of 17.0 years (R = 14-21). There are 811 total years of experience represented by the thirty-eight new superintendents.

Regarding total years of administrative experience, the following category means apply:

Category A	10.4
Category B	13.7
Category C	15.9
Category D	13.0
Category E	18.5
Overall	12.7 years (Range = 0-30)

For those with prior superintendent experience, the average time spent as an administrator is 19.9 years. Those who have accepted their first superintendency have an administrative experience mean of 7.4 years. The thirty-four men recently named to superintendent positions reflect an average of 13.5 years of administrative experience; the administrative experience mean for the four women is 5.5 years.

Among the thirty-eight chief executives, the average number of years as a superintendent (excluding the current year) is 4.4. That figure reflects only male experience,

since no female in this sample has prior experience as a superintendent.

The total number of prior superintendent positions held by members of this sample is 64, providing a mean of 1.7 former superintendencies (R = 0-4). Data gathered relative to the tenure of immediate predecessors demonstrates a mean of 5.7 years for all categories. Fifteen of the thirty-eight predecessors held the position for three years or less, while five were in the position for ten or more years (R = 1-22).

Conditions and Expectations

Respondents were given to identify how many and what types of board turnover have occurred in their district during the past three years. The options were:

A. Appointed to fill an unexpired term
B. Elected to fill an unexpired term
C. Elected in a contested election, but not against an incumbent
D. Elected over an incumbent
E. Other (please specify)

None of the superintendents chose option E to explain board succession.

By district category (A-E), the numbers and types of changes in board makeup during the past three years were as follows:

	A	B	C	D	
Category A	25	10	8	5	(N = 48)
Category B	6	6	4	2	(N = 18)

Category C	6	2	3	3	(N = 14)
Category D	2	0	0	0	(N = 2)
Category E	1	0	3	0	(N = 4)
Overall	40	18	18	10	(N = 86)

With a total of 86 incidents of board turnover among the 38 districts, each district averaged 2.3 changes in board makeup over a three-year period. The range of turnover was from two districts with none all the way to two other districts with eight changes in board membership. It was impossible (using this instrument) to determine why the changes occurred, but it is interesting to note that 40 changes (46.6%) involved filling unexpired terms, eighteen new board members (20.9%) were elected both in uncontested elections and in contested elections where the incumbent was not running, and 10 changes (11.6%) came about as a result of incumbent defeat in an election.

The new superintendents were next asked to describe board sentiment about conditions existing in the district when they were hired. They were given the options listed below.

A. High degree of satisfaction, desire to continue in the same direction
B. General satisfaction, limited need for change
C. Moderate dissatisfaction, general need for change
D. High degree of dissatisfaction, specific and dramatic need for change

By category, their responses are included in the next illustration.

	A	B	C	D	
Category A	2	8	3	7	(N = 20)
Category B	0	1	3	3	(N = 7)
Category C	2	1	3	2	(N = 8)
Category D	0	0	1	0	(N = 1)
Category E	1	0	0	1	(N = 2)
Overall	5	10	10	13	(N = 38)

When one considers that options A and B indicate board satisfaction with the district's direction, while options C and D reflect dissatisfaction and a desire for change, it is worthwhile to observe that Category A districts were evenly split (10 satisfied, 10 dissatisfied). In Category B, only 14% of the boards exhibited satisfaction, while an overwhelming 86% displayed dissatisfaction. Category C districts were slanted in the dissatisfied direction (38% satisfied, 62% dissatisfied), the one respondent in Category D indicated dissatisfaction, and the two in Category E were polarized. Overall, fifteen of the thirty-eight boards, or 39%, were classified by their new superintendents as being satisfied with the district's current situation, while twenty-three, or 61%, were considered to be dissatisfied.

In response to whether or not they were given mandates by their board upon being hired, twenty-four of the new superintendents (63%) indicated that they were. This is consistent with the scenario described in the previous

paragraph, wherein 61% of the boards were viewed as dissatisfied with existing conditions in the district and were ready for change. At the same time, among the thirty-three outsiders hired, twenty (61%) indicated that they were given mandates by their new board. There is an exact match in percentages between the responses to survey items 11 and those of the outside superintendents in item 12. It is somewhat surprising that, among the five superintendents hired from inside, 80% indicated that they were given mandates for action by the board. Whether or not any conclusions should be drawn from that collection of responses is questionable however, due to the limited sample size.

Appendix D displays the descriptors used to identify what each new superintendent felt the board was looking for when he or she was hired. Since item 13 was open-ended, not all responses used the same terminology. For the sake of simplicity however, similar responses were matched as much as possible. Forty different qualities were identified, and the ten qualities mentioned most often are listed below.

1. successful experience
2. leadership
   active in community
4. public relations
   understands finance
   communicator
7. accepts responsibility
8. understands curriculum
9. generates ideas
   team builder/manager

Conclusions

Carlson (1972) observes that when the administration of a school district is perceived as unsatisfactory, the appointment will go to a career-bound (outside) individual. If the administration is perceived as satisfactory by the board, the appointment will go to either type (career- or place-bound). Carlson contends that it is natural for school boards to call on a place-bound (inside) superintendent when things are going well, since the insider knows the school system and its history and is undoubtedly well-informed of its programs, problems, sources of support, philosophy, and personnel. Sometimes, however, no one from within the school district has the necessary experience or credentials to be given the superintendency. When this situation occurs, the call must go to someone from outside. Someone from outside is also brought in when the opposite is true as well, when there are too many from within who are qualified.

Carlson also suggests that in many instances, involuntary board turnover impacts what type of superintendent is hired. When a board challenger unseats an incumbent, the majority of the voters believed, as did the winner, that a gap existed between performance and expectations regarding the school system. Further, the challenger feels he or she has a mandate to strive for

improvement. Thus, when a school board contains a new member, the presence of the presumed mandate might have a bearing on the selection of a successor to the superintendency when that situation arises. Thus, a board containing a victorious challenger includes at least one member somewhat committed to the notion that all is not right with the school system; and if his stance gains favor with the other members, then the successor will be career-bound.

Another major conclusion drawn from Carlson's work may be that when the board is dissatisfied with the administration of the schools, the new superintendent is given a mandate to act. As the level of dissatisfaction increases, so does the intensity of the mandate. The almost perfect match between the level of board dissatisfaction recognized by the participants in this study and the number who received mandates from the board to act is not only interesting, but supports Carlson's position about the conditions under which new superintendents receive mandates.

Although the data collected as part of this study are limited, particularly as they pertain to inside, or place-bound, selection, the aforementioned assumptions from Carlson do hold up when matched with the experiences in the districts under observation in this study. Due to the necessary restrictions imposed on this study from the outset, it would be inappropriate and foolish to contend

that sufficient observations have been completed, or data collected, to enable one to reach significant conclusions. It is quite obvious, however, that value could be gained by taking the data collected for this study, expanding the scope by observing the superintendent succession cycle over several years, and building a well-documented case for assessing the validity of Carlson's conclusions nearly two decades after they were first published.

References

Aplin, N.D., & Daresh, J.C. (1984). The superintendent as an educational leader. Planning and Changing, 15(4), 209-218.

Austin, G.R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for efffectiveness. Educational Leadership, 37(3), 10-14.

Brady, G.F., Fulmer, R.M., & Helmich, D.L. (1982). Planning executive succession: The effect of recruitment source and organizational problems on anticipated tenure. Strategic Management Journal, 3, 269-275.

Carlson, R.O. (1972). School superintendents: Careers and performance. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Edmonds, R.R. (1981). Making public schools effective. Social Policy, 12, 56-60.

Korn, L. (1983). Selecting chief executives: Their relationship with a corporation. A speech delivered at the Business Week Conference for Senior Human Resource Executives, New York City, November 14, 1983.

Lipham, J.M. (1981). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

March, J.C., & March, J.G. (1977). Almost random careers: The Wisconsin school superintendency, 1940-1972. Administration Science Quarterly, 22(3), 377-409.

Mines, H.T. (1980). Finding and using executive talent. Business Horizons, 6, 45-48.

Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1982). Effective schools: A review. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Sendor, E. (1981). Should your new superintendent be an insider or an outsider? American School Board Journal, 168(10), 30-31, 42.

APPENDIX A

February 20, 1987

369 Cleveland Hall
Pullman, WA 99164-2136

Congratulations for being one of 42 superintendents hired in the state of Washington prior to the 1986-87 school year. I trust that your year is going well, and that both you and your board of directors have been pleased by your move. As a school superintendent for the past five years, I can relate to many of the success stories as well as the feelings of perplexity which you're experiencing. Currently a full-time doctoral student at Washington State University, I can honestly report that the temporary change of scenery, the revised workload, and the vastly different responsibilities have worked out well for me and my family. I do enthusiastically anticipate rejoining your esteemed ranks within the forseeable future however.

As a student in Don Reed's ED AD 582 course (Policy Formation), I have focused on the selection of a new chief executive as the most important policy decision that a school district's board of directors is ever forced to make. In partial fulfillment of the course requirements, I am engaging in an important yet simplified study of the conditions which existed in Washington districts which experienced a change in superintendents at the beginning of this school year. In particular, I am interested in exploring the relationship between existing conditions within a district and the expectations laid out by the board for the new superintendent.

As a former superintendent, I am acutely aware of the overwhelming demand for your time and attention to complete surveys and assist with projects of this type; hence, the enclosed survey is brief. In addition, I recognize that surveys of this type may encroach upon potentially sensitive areas in some districts and with some superintendents. With that in mind, I merely request that you respond as fully and completely as you feel comfortable doing, and I assure you that the anonymity and confidentiality of your responses will be maintained. The results of this survey will be used only for the purpose of this project, and will not be included in an in-depth research project nor for publication or dissertation purposes.

The target audience for this survey is small. Since this survey is being mailed to only the 42 newly-selected superintendents in this state, each potential respondent represents a statistically significant portion of the total sample, and the importance of your participation is magnified. I am operating under an externally-imposed April 1 deadline for completion of this project, so I would appreciate your expeditious cooperation. Please complete the brief enclosed survey and return it so that I may receive it no later than Friday, March 13.

Please accept my sincere thanks in advance for your willingness to be of assistance. Best wishes for continued success in your new position and throughout your career.

Cordially,

Samuel E. Gerla

Enclosure(s)

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF NEW SUPERINTENDENTS

For Items 1-9, indicate your response in the space provided.

____ 1. What is the enrollment in your school district?

A. 1-500
B. 501-2,000
C. 2,001-5,000
D. 5,001-10,000
E. ABOVE 10,000

____ 2. Is this your first year in this school district?

A. YES
B. NO

If YES, continue with Item 3. If NO, indicate your most recent position held in this district, and skip to Item 5.

_____

____ 3. What was your most recent position held in your former district?

A. SUPERINTENDENT
B. ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
C. PRINCIPAL
D. OTHER (please specify)_____

____ 4. What was the enrollment in your former district?

A. 1-500
B. 501-2,000
C. 2,001-5,000
D. 5,001-10,000
E. ABOVE 10,000

____ 5. How many total years have you completed as an educator?

____ 6. How many total years have you completed as an administrator?

____ 7. How many total years have you completed as a superintendent?

____ 8. Including your current position, how many superintendencies have you held?

____ 9. How many years did your predecessor hold the position?

For Items 10-13, indicate your response in the space provided. Feel free to provide as much detail and/or background information as is appropriate. Should you need additional space, please label and use another sheet of paper. Remember--confidentiality will be maintained; neither you nor your district will be identified in any way.

10. How many new members have been seated on your board of director within the past three years? ____ Please indicate below the number seated under each circumstance.

____ A. Appointed to fill an unexpired term

____ B. Elected in an uncontested election

____ C. Elected in a contested election, but not against an incumbent

____ D. Elected over an incumbent

____ E. Other (specify) _____

_____

Comments _____

_____

_____

____ 11. What were the feelings of your board of directors about existing conditions in your district when you were hired?

A. High degree of satisfaction, desire to continue in same direction

B. General satisfaction, limited need for change

C. Moderate dissatisfaction, general need for change

D. High degree of dissatisfaction, specific and dramatic need for change

12. Upon being hired, did you receive any mandate(s) for action from your board of directors? If so, please describe.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Using brief descriptors, please identify what type of a superintendent your board of directors was looking for when they hired you.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this survey, please indicate below.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

APPENDIX C

SURVEY DATA

Demographic Information

Thirty-eight of forty surveys (95%) were completed and returned. They were then alphabetized and assigned numbers based on alphabetical rank. Those numbers are reflected in the column on the left.

ITEMS

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
CATEGORY A (1-500)								
2.	A	A-C	A	25	13	10	3	1
3.	A	-	B	17	0	0	1	1
8.	A	C	A	22	14	7	2	3
9.	A	A	C	25	20	10	2	1
12.	A	A	A	36	30	10	3	4
13.	A	B	C	23	8	0	1	17
16.	B	-	-	16	2	0	0	6
17.	A	A	A	27	4	4	2	4
18.	A	A	B	25	15	6	2	4
19.	A	C	B	14	3	0	1	1
21.	A	C	B	9	3	0	1	3.5
23.	B	-	-	16	2	1	1	2.5
24.	A	A	B	24	15	10	2	6
25.	A	C	A	16	7	0	1	8
27.	A	B-C	A	16	9	0	1	3
29.	A	A	A	25	23	12	4	8
30.	A	A	A	18	18	18	2	5
33.	A	B	-	8	6	0	1	4
35.	A	D	A	12	1	0	1	1
38.	A	A	A	29	13	9	3	2
CATEGORY B (501-2,000)								
7.	A	A	A	20	12	8	2	5
14.	A	A	B	27	19	8	3	5
15.	A	B	C	21	13	0	1	2
20.	B	-	-	18	10	0	1	8
26.	A	B	E	27	15	0	1	8
36.	A	A	B	20	15	5	2	2
37.	B	-	-	18	12	0	1	3

CATEGORY C (2,001-5,000)

1.	A	B	D	22	17	2	2	3
4.	A	B	E	21	15	0	1	22
5.	A	B	C	14	7	0	1	7
10.	A	B	E	29	17	1	1	19
11.	A	D	E	27	14	0	1	10
22.	A	A	A	32	27	18	3	8
32.	B	-	-	14	7	2	1	3
34.	A	A	B	27	23	12	3	3

CATEGORY D (5,001-10,000)

31.	A	B	E	21	13	0	1	5

CATEGORY E (ABOVE 10,000)

6.	A	A	C	28	18	2	2	8
28.	A	A	C	22	19	13	3	12

Conditions and Expectations

ITEM 10

	A	B	C	D	E

CATEGORY A (1-500)

2.	0	1	0	0	0
3.	4	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0	0
12.	3	0	0	0	0
13.	0	1	0	1	0
16.	2	1	1	0	0
17.	1	0	2	0	0
18.	2	1	0	1	0
19.	2	1	0	0	0
21.	2	2	2	2	0
23.	3	0	0	0	0

24.	2	0	0	0	0
25.	1	0	0	0	0
27.	0	0	1	1	0
29.	0	1	0	0	0
30.	2	1	0	0	0
33.	1	1	0	0	0
35.	0	0	2	0	0

CATEGORY B (501-2,000)

7.	0	0	1	0	0
14.	0	0	1	0	0
15.	0	1	0	0	0
20.	1	0	0	0	0
26.	4	2	1	1	0
36.	1	0	1	0	0
37.	0	3	0	1	0

CATEGORY C (2,001-5,000)

1.	1	0	1	0	0
4.	0	0	0	1	0
5.	1	0	0	0	0
10.	1	0	0	0	0
11.	2	0	0	0	0
22.	0	0	2	0	0
32.	0	0	0	1	0
34.	1	2	0	1	0

CATEGORY D (5,001-10,000)

31.	2	0	0	0	0

CATEGORY E (ABOVE 10,000)

6.	0	0	2	0	0
28.	1	0	1	0	0

ITEM 11

CATEGORY A (1-500)

A: 12, 13

B: 8, 9, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 33

C: 2, 3, 21

D: 16, 17, 23, 27, 30, 35, 38

CATEGORY B (501-2,000)

A:

B: 20

C: 15, 26, 36

D: 7, 14, 37

CATEGORY C (2,001-5,000)

A: 5, 11

B: 34

C: 1, 10, 32

D: 4, 22

CATEGORY D (5,001-10,000)

C: 31

CATEGORY E (ABOVE 10,000)

A: 28

D: 6

ITEM 12

CATEGORY A (1-500)

No Mandate: 2, 9, 12, 13, 19, 24, 25, 29

Mandate Given:

3.	Improve student discipline; improve building climate; pass second half (?) of two-year capital improvement levy
8.	Be visible in community and at school; monthly newsletter to district/weekly to parents; capitalize on strengths of principal; support positive and productive teacher evaluation
16.	Bring the staff together, working cooperatively toward a goal of excellence
17.	Openness; honesty; curriculum improvement; bond levy; educational leader; good fiscal judgement
18.	Be personal; show sensitivity; listen well
21.	Personnel concerns
23.	Turn climate around in a positive direction; boost morale; improve instructional program; provide solid financial footing
27.	Re-establish discipline in school; establish communication lines; establish board/supt. relations
30.	Improve the district's image, both in the state and within the community
33.	Follow through on difficult building project
35.	Bury friction created from preceding year
38.	Take charge of new building program; stabilize expenditures

CATEGORY B (501-2,000)

No Mandate: 14

Mandate Given:

7.	Take charge; demonstrate honesty; community involvement
15.	Do not give out boundary waivers
20.	Communications
26.	Improve communications with community; improve staff relations; focus on curriculum
36.	Make a good system better
37.	Fiscal accountability; conflict management; stabilize employee/employer relations; emphasize teacher supervision (instruction) and evaluation; greater accountability/expectations of mid-management

CATEGORY C (2,001-5,000)

No Mandate: 4, 5, 10, 32, 34

Mandate Given:

1.	Improve fiscal management; improve communications and responsiveness from administration to board; implement new planning process; improve evaluation of staff
11.	Involve all board members equally in activities and policy making of the district; continue emphasis on curriculum/instruction; improve staff relations and visibilitiy
22.	Improve discipline; standardize curriculum; improve building maintenance; be involved in community and improve P.R.; publish a regular newsletter

CATEGORY D (5,001-10,000)

31.	Mandates given, but did not wish to identify them

CATEGORY E (ABOVE 10,000)

Mandate Given:

6. Return the district to its former reputation as a "lighthouse" district; give the staff direction and organization (cohesive sense of purpose); clean up numerous problems swept under the carpet by predecessor; assume responsibility and accountability

28. Move district ahead

ITEM 13

CATEGORY A (1-500)

2. Knowledgeable; understanding; decision-making; P.R.; accepts responsibilities; understands school law, finance and school board policy; provides experience and good ideas

3. People skills; job knowledge; leadership

8. Genuine interest in school; active interest in community; likes being around students, staff and community; good fiscal skills; understands curriculum; ability to organize others to pass levy

9. Probably experienced

12. Strong and successful administrative background who wanted to work in a small school

13. High degree of people skills; good organizational skills; experience in curriculum development; experience in supervision; demonstrated success in team building; high degree of enthusiasm

16. One who could bring about reconciliation and who had high standards for academic achievement

17. Excellent track record (not a reject); fiscal skills; curriculum background

18. Personable; friendly; boardsmanship

19. Competent; calm; people skills; improve relationship with staff and community

21. Communicator; enthusiastic; listener; ability to perform

23. Active; aware; knowledgeable; concerned; committed; respected; leader; motivator

24. Public relations; communication; leadership

25. Leader; good communication skills; P.R.

27. Honest; hard working; visible; communicator

29. Experience; doctorate; fiscal skills; communication

30. Desire to help students; build staff morale; experience in finance and other educational administrative practices in this state

33. Honest; hardworking; tough; intelligent

35. First a teacher; maintainer of status quo

38. Competent; trustworthy; loyal; dedicated; ambitious

CATEGORY B (501-2,000)

7. Outgoing; an active community member; competent, proven financial management ability; honesty between board and staff; leadership; P.R.

14. Experience; take charge

15. Aggressive; visible; extensive backgroung in all facets of administration

20. Willing to spend time necessary for positive situation

26. Communicate; make changes without creating antipathy

36. Participative team management

37. Professionalism; expertize in supervision of instruction and evaluation; fiscal management skills; firm, yet approachable; willing to listen and be responsive to the community

CATEGORY C (2,001-5,000)

1. Good communicator; honesty in dealing with people; openness to criticism, suggestions; good organizational and management skills; willingness to be out in community

4. Strong educational leader; well developed interpersonal skills; experienced with personnel selection, staff development, and school budgeting

5. Team manager; utilizes innovative educational leadership techniques; good communicator; experience with school construction; strong curriculum background

10. Objective; professional

11. Outgoing; K-12 teaching/administrative experience; participatory management style; knowledge/experience in curriculum and instruction; active resident in community

22. Conservative; community oriented; strong leader; open and direct in communications; involved in community

32. Good fiscal management abilities; human relations skills; ability to "mend fences"

34. Educationally oriented; upstanding character; fiscally responsible; experienced in curriculum development; provider of leadership; respected by staff; skillful communicator

CATEGORY D (5,001-10,000)

31. Visionary; progressive; program/curriculum expert; human relations skills

CATEGORY E (ABOVE 10,000)

6. Strong leader; visible; sense of direction; good decision-making skills; sensitive yet firm; accountable; good planner; works well with people

28. Leader; goal oriented; team player

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTORS OF WHAT BOARDS ARE LOOKING FOR IN SUPERINTENDENTS

		RESPONSES	(RANK)
1.	knowledgeable |||||	5	
2.	decision-maker ||	2	
3.	public relations ||||| |||||	10	(4T)
4.	accepts responsibility ||||| |||	8	(7)
5.	understands school law |	1	
6.	understands finance ||||| |||||	10	(4T)
7.	understands board/supt. relations ||	2	
8.	successful experience ||||| ||||| ||	12	(1)
9.	generates ideas ||||| |	6	(9T)
10.	leadership ||||| ||||| |	11	(2T)
11.	interest in students ||	2	
12.	active in community ||||| ||||| |	11	(2T)
13.	understands curriculum ||||| ||	7	(8)
14.	organizational skills |||	3	
15.	ability to pass levies |	1	
16.	small school skills and interest |	1	
17.	supervision skills ||	2	
18.	team builder/manager ||||| |	6	(9T)
19.	enthusiasm |||||	5	
20.	reconciliation skills ||	2	
21.	emphasis on academic achievement |	1	
22.	good listener ||	2	
23.	communicator ||||| |||||	10	(4T)
24.	personable |	1	
25.	calm |	1	
26.	motivator ||	2	
27.	honest ||||	4	
28.	respected ||	2	
29.	first a teacher |	1	
30.	maintainer of status quo |	1	
31.	loyal |	1	
32.	doctorate |	1	
33.	tough |||	3	
34.	aggressive |	1	
35.	professionalism ||	2	
36.	experience with school construction |	1	
37.	objectivity |	1	
38.	conservative |	1	
39.	upstanding character |	1	
40.	progressive |	1	